

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 02-2109**

---

MOMOLU V.S. SIRLEAF; ELOUISE A. SIRLEAF,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

F. VERNON BOOZER; EDWARD C. COVAHEY, JR.;  
THOMAS P. DORE; ROGER J. SULLIVAN, Attorneys,  
Substituted Trustees and agents, Covahey &  
Boozer; DONNA HILD, Legal Assistant and Agent,  
Covahey & Boozer; COVAHEY & BOOZER; FIRST  
TRUST NATIONAL ASSOCIATION; CITICORP MORTGAGE,  
INCORPORATED; CITIMORTGAGE, INCORPORATED,  
Member of Citigroup; CITIBANK & CITIGROUP,  
INCORPORATED; MAINUDDIN JANGI; NORWEST  
MORTGAGE, INCORPORATED,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. Benson E. Legg, District Judge. (CA-01-  
3823-L)

---

Submitted: December 19, 2002

Decided: December 30, 2002

---

Before WILKINS and KING, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON,\* Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

\* Senior Judge Hamilton did not participate in consideration  
of this case. The opinion is filed by a quorum of the panel  
pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 46(d).

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Momolu V.S. Sirleaf, Elouise A. Sirleaf, Appellants Pro Se.  
Douglas Windsor Biser, MUDD, HARRISON & BURCH, Towson, Maryland;  
Robert Scott Brennen, MILES & STOCKBRIDGE, Baltimore, Maryland, for  
Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

---

PER CURIAM:

Momolu V.S. and Elouise A. Sirleaf seek to appeal the district court's order denying reconsideration of an order striking their complaint and directing that they file an amended complaint within ten days. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2000), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2000); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949). The order the Sirleafs seek to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order, as the district court has yet to enter a final order in their case. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED